

Appl. No. 09/717,841
Amdt. Dated March 24, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 24, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Two claims have been amended and no new claims have been added by this Response. Consequently, it is believed that no additional claim fees have been generated by this filing. It is believed that a one-month extension of time is required. A Petition For Extension of Time accompanies this Response. If it is determined, however, that any additional fees are due in this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 14-1190 in the amount of such fees.

The pending claims have been rejected together as a single group via a general citation to a group of various references. The references have not been specifically identified and the manner in which they are being applied to the various pending claims has not been described. Further, the specific basis (for example, 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103, etc.) supporting the rejection of each pending claim has not been described. Applicants request that any asserted rejections be supported by a clear explanation on a claim-by-claim basis so that a complete analysis of the Office's concerns can be performed and an informed response can be prepared.

In order to advance the prosecution of this matter, however, Applicants offer the following comments. It is believed that the cited references do not teach a system, such as is claimed in independent claim 16, having a portable data processing assembly with a coupling arrangement as claimed. For example, Gombrich et al. (USP 4,857,716) and Zook et al. (USP 4,850,009) show only a wall-mounted, non-portable receiving unit. Kumar et al. (USP 4,621,189) does not disclose a coupling arrangement and a non-contact reader in the manner claimed.

Appl. No. 09/717,841
Amdt. Dated March 24, 2004

Reply to Office Action of Nov. 24, 2003

Regarding independent claim 23, it is believed that the cited references do not teach a system having a base unit that is portable with a recess and a coupling arrangement as claimed. For example, Gombrich et al. (USP 4,857,716) and Zook et al. (USP 4,850,009) show only a wall-mounted, non-portable receiving unit. Kumar et al. (USP 4,621,189) does not disclose a coupling arrangement and a non-contact reader in the manner claimed.

Regarding independent claim 37, it is believed that the cited references do not teach a system having a user-supportable reader module receiving unit with a recess and a coupling arrangement as claimed. Again, for example, Gombrich et al. (USP 4,857,716) and Zook et al. (USP 4,850,009) show only a wall-mounted, non-portable receiving unit. Kumar et al. (USP 4,621,189) does not disclose a coupling arrangement and a non-contact reader in the manner claimed.

In addition, the Office Action contains a general reference to non-contact readers that is not supported by any references or any other proper basis. Consequently, Applicants request that any underlying reference or basis be disclosed or that any rejections based thereon be withdrawn.

Finally, the Applicants have previously elected the group including claims 16-29 and 37-44 with traverse. This was a provisional election of the type required by 37 CFR 1.143. Applicants have requested reconsideration and subsequent withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Applicants believe that the above remarks provide a complete response given the content of the Office Action. It is further believed that it has been established that the

Appl. No. 09/717,841

Amdt. Dated March 24, 2004

Reply to Office Action of Nov. 24, 2003

pending claims are allowable. Entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of

Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By



Michael F. Williams
Reg. No. 39,875

Simmons, Perrine, Albright & Ellwood, P.L.C.
115 First Street SE, Suite 1200
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401-1266
Telephone: (319) 366-7641 (ext. 222)
Facsimile No. (319) 366-1917